WO BLIN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA Lawrence L. Peterson, No. CV 04-2276-PHX-SMM (LOA) Plaintiff, **ORDER** VS. Maricopa County, et al., 

Defendant.

Plaintiff, Lawrence L. Peterson, filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against Maricopa County, Sheriff Joseph M. Arpaio, and various named employees of the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office alleging that his constitutional rights were violated by (1) overcrowded and unsafe conditions; (2) denial of outside recreational activities; (3) an inadequate and tainted diet; (4) deliberate indifference to his medical needs; (5) unsanitary conditions; and (6) retaliation (Doc. #13). Plaintiff now seeks to dismiss his action because he was denied an extension of time, he has no experience in the law, he has been unable to retain counsel, he cannot afford to make copies and mail materials to the Court, and he is being returned to Maricopa County custody (Doc. #36). Defendants do not oppose the motion (Doc. #38).

Although the parties have not entered into a signed stipulation, Defendants specifically stated that they do not oppose the dismissal. <u>See</u> Fed.R.Civ.P. 41(a) (providing that "an action may be dismissed by the plaintiff . . . by filing a stipulation of dismissal

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Court dismissed the remaining Defendants and Counts pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a) (Doc. #14).

1	signed by all parties who have appeared in the action"). Accordingly, because the parties
2	agree to a dismissal of the instant action, Plaintiff's motion will be granted.
3	IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. # 36) is GRANTED
4	Plaintiff's action is dismissed. The Clerk of Court shall enter a judgment of dismissa
5	accordingly.
6	DATED this 19 <sup>th</sup> day of June, 2007.
7	
8	
9	Mich ( )
10	Stephen M. McNamee United States District Judge
11	United States District Judge
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

Case 2:04-cv-02276-SMM-LOA Document 42 Filed 06/19/07 Page 2 of 2